

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3, 9, 11, 13 through 15, 17, 18, and 20 remain in the applications. Claims 1, 2, 4 through 8, 10, 12, 16, and 19 have been cancelled. Re-examination and reconsideration of the application as amended are requested.

The examiner has stated that the drawings filed are objected to in that they do not show every feature of the claim. She states the drawing to not show every feather of claim 1. Applicant has cancelled claim 1 and believes he has overcome this objection. The examiner has also objected to the drawings as to claim 19. Applicant has cancelled claim 19.

The examiner has objected to claim 1, 3-5, 7-10 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The examiner states that the specification does not refer to each flaps other edges releasably attaching to the piece of fabric as in claim 1. Applicant has cancelled claim 1. Claim 3 is now dependant on claim 11. Claim 11 does not refer to the other edges being releasably attached to the piece of fabric. Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10 have been deleted. Claim 9 is now dependant on claim 11. Claim 11 does not refer to the other edges being releasably attached to the piece of fabric.

The examiner goes on to state that claim 19 calls for two more pins than those described. Applicant has deleted claim 19. The examiner states that applicant has misspelled "groove" throughout the application. Applicant has made the proper changes.

The examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13-15 and 17-20 under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. Applicant has cancelled claim 1. Examiner states that in Claim 7-9, 11, 17 and 18 there is on antecedent basis for "outer flaps" In claim 11 applicant has deleted the word "outer" and replaced it with the words "saw tooth". The antecedent basis for "saw tooth flaps" is found in paragraph e. Applicant has also made this change in claims 9, 17 and 18. Claims 1, 4,5, 7, and 8 have been cancelled. Claim 19 has also been cancelled. Applicant believes he had overcome these objections.


The examiner has objected to the abstract because it was not provided on a separate sheet. Applicant has provided for the abstract on a separate page.

The examiner states that claims 3, 9, 11, 13 through 15, 17, 18, and 20 are patentable is rewritten properly. Applicant believe he has accomplished this.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection and objections is requested.

Allowance of claims 1 through 12 and 14 through 39 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jerry Semer  
~~Attorney at Law~~  
617 Croghan Street  
Fremont, Ohio 43420  
419-332-2221  
#33,087